DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 636 EA 024 423

AUTHOR Bates, Richard
TITLE Leadership and School Culture.
PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Interuniversity Congress of the Organization of Teaching Faculty of Philosophy and Science of Education (Seville, Spain, December 15-19, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Context; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); *Leadership; Organizational Climate; Politics of Education; *Power Structure; *Social Structure; Sociocultural Patterns

ABSTRACT

Present attempts to transform the meaning and purposes of schooling through a radically reformed notion of leadership are examined in this paper. The first part presents a framework that explains the mechanisms through which school cultures are produced, reproduced, and transformed: pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, and discipline. The first puzzle of culture and leadership involves cultural formation and cultural difference. The paper refers to the cultural battles that occur under the umbrella of the pursuit of modernity; the transformation of social structures increasingly dominated by industrialism, capitalism, surveillance, and control; the shifts in cultural formation and production that result; the battle between lifeworld and system; the dangers of a commodification of culture and the emergence of repressive regimes of power and of a political economy of truth that, among other things, is produced and transmitted under the control of a few great political and economic apparatuses. These are battles that effect both individual and collective futures. Because schools are centrally concerned with such futures, school leaders must understand these issues and the ways in which they are articulated through the school's message systems. The second puzzle involves purpose and practice in the school. Alternative implications of current attempts to refashion the four message systems are described. The third puzzle examines leadership as a moral question; choices made by educational leaders are historical in that they change history and are judged by history. (Contains 12 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353636

Leadership and School Culture.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Bates

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Richard Bates
Faculty of Education
Deakin University
Australia 3217

II Congreso Interuniversitario de Organizacion Escolar
Facultad de Filosofia y Ciencias de la Educacion
Universidad de Sevilla
Sevilla, 15-19 de Diciembre de 1992

EA 024 423

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I have been asked to speak about 'Leadership and School Culture'.

Six months ago when the invitation arrived it seemed a straightforward enough task so I accepted, with all the more pleasure as it offered my first chance to visit a country which was for so long the cross roads of Europe and the place where Christian and Moorish cultures met. Besides, I remembered Laurie Lee's wonderful evocation of my own adolescent dreams of far off places :

> Ever since childhood I'd imagined myself walking down a white dusty road through groves of orange trees to a city called Seville. This fantasy may have been induced by the Cotswold damp, or by something my mother had told me, but it was one of several such cliches which had brought me to Spain, and now, as I approached the city on this autumn morning it was as though I was simply following some old direction.
>
> In fact there was no white road, not even a gold-clustered orange tree, but Seville itself was dazzling -a creamy crustation of flower-banked houses fanning out from each bank of the river. The Moorish occupation had bequeathed the affection for water around which so many of even the poorest dwellings were built -a thousand miniature patios set with inexhaustible fountains which fell trickling upon ferns and leaves, each a nest of green repeated in endless variations around this theme of domestic oasis...
>
> Seville in the morning was white and gold, the gold-lit river reflecting the Toro de Oro, with flashes of sun striking the Giralda Tower and the spires of the prostrate cathedral. The interior of the cathedral was a bronze half light, a huge cavern of private penance, with an occasional old woman hobbling about on her knees, mumbling a string of prayers, or some transfixed girl standing in a posture of agony, arms stretched before the bleeding Christ...
>
> The Seville quays were unpretentious...Yet it was from this narrow river, fifty miles from the sea, that Columbus sailed to discover America, followed a few years later by the leaking caravelles of Magellan, one of which was the first to encircle the world. Indeed, the waterfront at Seville, with its

> paddling boys and orange boats, and its mossy provincial stones, was for almost five hundred years ... history's most significant launching pad.
>
> (Lee, 1969)

So thank you for your invitation.

By coincidence I write this paper during the Melbourne International Festival which, this year, celebrates the culture of Spain in both the Old and New Worlds. A week of Spanish drama, music, literature, dance. So I write not only with memories of an imagined place in my mind but also with the sounds of Spain ringing in my ears.

But it is one thing to anticipate and enjoy culture and quite another to write about it!

Culture is both an obviously useful concept and a peculiarly complex one. The idea of culture is clearly associated with the idea of a distinctive way of life. This is the notion of culture which informs one of the world's largest industries - tourism- which promises above all else the chance to experience other cultures, other ways of life, the mystery, the excitement, the novelty, the danger of coming face to face with <u>difference</u>: but all with the security of knowing that you have a return ticket to your own culture in your pocket or tucked away in the safe at the Hilton.

Yet in the face of this commonplace recognition of cultural difference we talk of <u>school culture</u> as if it was the same the world over. We speak as though there were something both unique and universal about the culture of this ubiquitous social institution which transcends cultural boundaries and retains its similarity across cultural divides. Despite the difference of local cultures a school culture is school culture is school culture. Clearly there is a puzzle here: the puzzle of cultural formation and cultural difference.

School is another term which is both obviously useful and subtly problematic. While we would recognise the essential elements of a school in almost any time or place schools have existed and do exist in almost infinite variety: with or without classrooms, with or without formal curriculum, as places of initiation or debriefing, as places of liberation or indoctrination, as places of pleasure or pain. If this diversity between schools was not enough we must also recognise that an individual school can be experienced in a multitude of contradictory ways by its inhabitants.There is clearly a puzzle here: the puzzle of purpose and practice.

And Leadership. What are we to say about leadership? While we can all recognise a leader when we see one, we do not necessarily approve of their habits. Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini and Franco were after all, all leaders. They were the embodiment of certain conceptions of virtue and purpose for which they were loved as well as hated, much as educational leaders are. There is clearly a further puzzle here: the puzzle of heroism and villany.

It looks then as though the apparently straightforward topic of Leadership and School Culture is by no means as simple as it might first appear. Perhaps I should have declined your invitation despite the romantic attractions of Andalucian culture!

I want to speak to these puzzles, but I want to speak to them within a contemporary context: one which attempts to understand present attempts to transform the meaning and purposes of schooling through a radically reformed notion of leadership. Before doing so I need to set out a framework which will explain my understanding of the mechanisms through which school cultures are produced, reproduced and transformed.

The Mechanisms of School Culture.

The principles of control which operate within schools, as Basil Bernstein reminded us, are strongly influenced by the principles of control that exist in the surrounding society. If the principles of control outside the school shift, so do those within the school. This is not always an immediate and unproblematic process because schools do possess some autonomy and in any case societies are often at war with themselves over the principles of social control that shall apply. Moreover, what happens in schools has some reciprocal effect on the wider society - which is why they are regarded as such dangerous institutions. Schools are institutions that must, at almost any cost, be domesticated! But there is likely to be a rough consonance between the organising principles of a society and the organising principles of its schools.

Schools fulfill two major purposes for their societies. The first is a cultural purpose: the production of virtue and character in accordance with some notion of the ideal citizen. This purpose is articulated through the *pedagogy* of the school. The second is an economic purpose: the production of knowledge and skills in accordance with a commitment to a particular means of production. This purpose is articulated through the *curriculum* of the school.

The pedagogical and curricular mechanisms for achieving these cultural and economic purposes are themselves shaped by and articulated through two further mechanisms. The first of these is the mechanism of *assessment* which objectifies the performance of individuals in ways which allow classification and comparison. The second is the mechanism of *discipline* which allocates rewards and punishments to individuals in terms of their performance: that is, their demonstration of virtue and skill.

The first two mechanisms - those of curriculum and pedagogy might be thought of as the educational message systems of the school. The latter mechanisms of assessment and discipline might be thought of as the administrative message systems of the school.

It is conventional to think of such mechanisms being constructed by teachers and imposed upon pupils, but in reality these mechanisms shape and define the behaviour of teachers as well: a matter to which I shall return.

Collectively these mechanisms provide the structures through which the culture of the school is articulated. But they are not simply technical mechanisms, they are mechanisms through which battles for the determination of school culture are fought. These battles are both internal and external to the school.

Cultural Battles

Battles over how the cultures of schools are to be constituted are commonplace: they occur regularly within and between communities, regions and nations. They frequently incorporate elements of the persistent and characteristic divisions of our societies: class, race, gender, religion, and geography. They are shaped by changes in the means of production and distribution. They are both personal and social. That is, they are essentially cultural battles, battles which address the meaning and purpose of our shared existence and the nature and production of individual identity.

To those of us engaged in the day to day battles of the classroom, staffroom, committee room and playground these may seem large claims. Yet they are claims I believe can be sustained, for we are just beginning to realise that the mundane and the momentous are linked in ways we have not previously recognised: that daily habits and global survival are not as independent as once we might have thought.

That cultural battles over schools and other institutional forms are both momentous and mundane should not suprise us, for it is culture that gives meaning to life. Culture is the framework that connects beliefs, values and knowledge with action. Culture is the context within and the material from which we form our societies and selves. Simultaneously our struggles to form our selves bring into question and transform particular connections between beliefs, values and knowledge as well establishing the propriety of particular actions. The construction and reconstruction of culture and the construction and reconstruction of identity are, therefore, inseperable. Just as the self is constructed and reconstructed through a systematic integration and clarification of beliefs, values and knowledge in the light of experience, so is culture constructed and reconstructed through the collective articulation of beliefs, values and knowledge through social action. In our daily lives individual experience and social action coincide as we construct and reconstruct ourselves and our cultures.

At least, that is the way it would be if we were left to ourselves! But, of course, the relation between self and society is mediated through some very pervasive institutional structures which both enable and constrain our desires. If culture is the product of historical struggles then institutions are their residue. They are the mud in which we wrestle for the future.

Culture and Modernity

The cultural struggle that has dominated the past two hundred years has been the struggle for modernity. This struggle has invented institutions which produce severe discontinuities with previous traditions. It has resulted in cultural forms which allow the development of selves which would be inconceivable to our forbears.

But what is the nature of modernity? Giddens (1991:15) characterises it by reference to industrialism ('the social relations implied in the widespread use of material power and machinery in production processes'); capitalism ('a system of commodity production involving both competitive markets and the commodification of labour power'); surveillance (the supervisory control of subject population, whether this takes the form of 'visible' supervision...or the use of information to coordinate social activities') and control ('the means of violence...in which the potential destructive power of weaponry...becomes immense').

The establishment of modernity depended upon the development of a radical view of knowledge and of its instrumental applicability to the problems of production and social organisation. The development of such knowledge from the Enlightenment onwards was to lead to the development of functionalist reason. This in turn would engender a science of nature and a science of society and allow the rational ordering of both in the interests of the perfection of humanity. Two hundred years of hindsight allow us to see both the achievements and the limitations of this conception of reason.

There have been suprises along the way. For instance, instrumental reason was expected to lead to a knowledge which unified nature and society on the basis of the certainty of scientific laws. Superstition and religion were to be replaced by appeal to the certainty of verifiable knowledge. Instead, as Giddens observes:

> Doubt, a pervasive feature of modern critical reason, permeates into everyday life as well as philosophical consciousness, and forms a general existential dimension of the contemporary social world. Modernity institutionalises the principle of radical doubt and insists that all knowledge takes the form of hypotheses: claims which may very well be true, but which are in principle always open to revision and may have at some point to be abandoned.
>
> (1991:2-3)

Similarly, the assumption that rational knowledge would lead to rational behaviour which would provide the cement of a unified social system seems to be challenged by the increasing diversity of options within an increasingly differentiated social world.

> The more tradition loses its hold, and the more daily life is reconstituted in terms of the dialectical interplay of the local and the global, the more individuals are forced to negotiate lifestyle choices among a diversity of options. Of course , there are standardising influences too - most notably, in the form of commodification, since capitalistic production and distribution form core components of modernity's institutions. Yet because of the 'openness' of social life today, the pluralisation of contexts of action and the diversity of 'authorities', lifestyle choice is increasingly important in the constitution of self-identity and daily activity.
>
> (Giddens, 1991:5)

Some have argued that this increasing diversity is indicative of a 'postmodern' culture:

> What has indeed emerged is not the standardisation and unification of consumption, but rather the enormous pluralization of tastes, practices, enjoyments and needs.
>
> (Heller, 1990:10)

The result is regarded by some as a society without any coherent and agreed norms and values: 'Postmodernism as a cultural movement...has a simple enough message: anything goes' (Heller, 1990:7).

This even applies to the social structures produced by capitalism itself through which politics has been organised: the structures of class.

> ...a problem presents itself with respect to this infinite variety, this pluralization of the ways of life, this demise of self-complacent and ethnocentric class cultures. Hannah Arendt, and others, have stressed that social classes are necessary for the conduct of rational politics. Classes can give birth to institutions (political organizations which represent their interests). Representative governments grow out of class society. If classes are on the wane, if cultures are becoming pluralized to the degree of total particularization, is a meaningful, rational decision-making process still possible?
>
> (Heller, 1990:11)

Moreover, if the political process is at a standstill, how are we to reach decisions concerning the organisation of our social life? Must we abandon politics and rely entirely for social decision making upon those remaining organisations which retain the capacity for decision making despite their insensitivity to cultural issues? Are we to rely completely on

> ...corporations organised according to functions..corporations (which) do not represent the interests of ways of life as a whole, but rather the interests of particular functions?
>
> (Heller, 1990:11)

Lifeworld and system.

The issue is put rather differently by Habermas (1987), who sees the current phase of the evolution of modernity as a battle between 'lifeworld' and 'system'. On one hand the lifeworld refers to what I have loosely refered to above as culture - that which gives meaning to life and allows for the shared construction of meaning through negotiation of our values, interests, commitments and understanding. On the other hand the system refers to those activities within society that are organised through the medium of money and power (markets and bureaucracies).

According to this view, one of the fundamental problems of the contemporary world is that the system encroaches more and more upon the lifeworld, intrudes more and more into the workings of those institutions which are concerned with the production of meaning, belief, understanding, aspiration and identity: in short, culture. One of the mechanisms by which this intrusion is carried forward is the mechanism of the market.

Throughout the Anglo-Saxon world (I cannot speak for any other) we are being encouraged to believe that the great institutions of the public sphere are inadequate and unable to deal with social and cultural change. They are, supposedly, holding back the dynamic of progress and creating the very problems they set out to solve. They should be abandoned and notions of public responsibility should be replaced by public choice exercised through markets. Social welfare, education, health, prisons, should be restructured as markets for services and privatised. The profit motive will ensure the public good. The system should further colonise the lifeworld. The invisible hand will take care of us all.

There is, however, a major problem with this agenda. The inability of markets to engender or sustain those social values and commitments upon which both markets and the wider society depend. Gitlin puts it this way:

> Now that Soviet style socialism is defunct, "the Market" is the world's leading utopia....But a working market requires something that buccaneer capitalism cannot deliver -a shared commons where the market takes place. A healthy society requires, and produces, a spirit of civility -a generosity of feeling, a widespread commitment to the furtherance of the common conversation about the common good. To use and old fashioned term, civil society cultivates and requires civic virtue. The ideal of Main Street...is one in

> which neighbours watch out for one another. But today the ideals of Main Street are constantly eaten away by the pursuit of the main chance....When marketplace reasoning predominates everywhere, the war of all against all explodes the provisional truces. In everyday life, the dissolution of solidarity in the solvent of indiscriminate rage gives us the embattled, desperado masculinity of slash and grunt movies.
>
> (Gitlin, 1992:15)

Culture, therefore both sustains and depends upon the production and reproduction of Main Street - of that commons where neighbours look out for each other. Even the Market is dependent upon the continuation of Main Street, of the notions of civic virtue which its untrammelled operations constantly undermine. A market society without Main Street is a slash and grunt society.

The Commodification of Culture.

One of the effects of this increasing intrusion of the market into everyday life is the transformation of culture into commodity. Culture, which is historically the result of painful struggles to integrate the collected knowledge, values, beliefs and experience of real people is commodified, it is turned into a product like any product which individuals can choose and purchase according to their means. In the market culture the individual relates to culture via the mechanism of purchase. The value of culture (beliefs, values, knowledge, experience) is determined in the market by price and volume of sales. The cumulative effect of such individual decisions is a declaration of what is valued by the society. Moreover what is most expensive must, in such an economy, be the most valuable. Thus Van Gogh's 'Irises' must have been the most valuable (important?) painting in the world when Alan Bond paid top price of $53.9 million for it. Two years later another Van Gogh must have eclipsed 'Irises' in importance when a Japanese industrialist paid $82 million.[1] Similarly, as astrology is a much bigger earner than astronomy, the value of astrology is defined by the market economy as greater than that of astronomy.

What is missing from such a crude notion of value is any observable intellectual or social content: any argument, any

---

[1] It is interesting to speculate whether owning the most expensive cultural icon in the world does anything to sustain the notion that its owner is therefore the most cultured person in the world.

debate, any social consideration of value or validity or even of the grounds on which such judgements might properly be made. No-one has discussed the basis on which such cultural products might be valued. Value emerges simply from market choices, and the market is to decide.

The cultural commodities provided by the market are, however, because of the exclusion of the social, unable to satisfy the needs of individuals for any depth of meaning to their existence. (Is 'Irises' <u>really</u> the most important painting in the world because if it isn't then someone has made a fool of me ?). 'I purchase therefore I am' (with its concomitant 'I cannot purchase therefore I am not') is as inadequate a definition of the self as it is a mechanism for the construction of culture. The intrusion of the market 'system' into the cultural conversation of the 'lifeworld' is, in the end, self-defeating as it destroys the grounds on which meaning itself is constructed.[2]

<u>Power and Truth.</u>

The other component of the *system* - that of the organising power of bureaucracy, is equally damaging to the construction of meaning. The relationship between knowledge and power is particularly well explored by Foucault who argues that the production and exercise of power is achieved, in the modern world, through the production of various discourses.

> ...in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power connot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation and functioning of discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth.
>
> (Foucault, 1980:125)

The form of this relationship has shifted dramatically during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which saw the emergence of

---

[2]This idea is developed further within the Australian context in my paper 'The emerging culture of educational administration and what we can do about it' .(Bates, 1992)

'...a technological invention in the order of power comparable with the steam engine in the order of production' (1980:71). It is a form of power that depends upon the collection and collation of knowledge about individuals.

> This invention had the pecularity of being utilised first of all on a local level, in schools, barracks and hospitals. This was where the experiment of integral surveillance was carried out. People learned how to establish dossiers, systems of marking and classifying, the integrated accountancy of individuals records...And, at a certain time, these methods began to become generalised (1980:71).

The form of power involved was directed towards

> ...obtaining productive service from individuals in their concrete lives. And in consequence, a real and effective 'incorporation' of power was necessary, in the sense that power had to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behaviour. Hence the significance of methods like school discipline, which succeeded in making children's bodies the objects of highly complex systems of manipulation and conditioning But at the same time, these new techniques of power needed to grapple with the phenomena of population, in short to undertake the administration, control and direction of the accumulation of men...hence there arise problems of demography, public health, hygiene, housing conditions, longevity and fertility (1980:125).

The political economy of truth which has emerged in our kind of society

> ...is characterised by five important traits. 'Truth' is centered on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; it is subject to constant economic and political inctement...;it is the object, under diverse forms, of immense diffusion and consumption...; it is produced and transmitted under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few great political andf economic apparatuses...; lastly, it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation.
>
> (Foucault, 1980:132).

However, as Foucault also points out, such 'offical' discourses and powers they generate are always open to subversion. Indeed, as

such discourses become more abstract, generalised and diffuse, the more generalised the power that is exercised, the more likely it is that at the local level alternative forms of discourse and power will develop. This phenomenon he labels as the *insurrection of subjugated knowledges* (1980:81). Moreover, he claims that it is these subjugated knowledges which can be recovered and articulated through genealogies of power.

> By comparison, then, and in contrast to the various projects which aim to inscribe knowledges of the hierachical order of power associated with science, a genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. It is based upon the reactivation of local knowledges...in opposition to the scientific hierachisation of knowledges and the effects intrinsic to their power....
>
> (Foucault,1980:85)

What I take this to mean is that 'local' knowledges are constructed in relation to 'local' needs; that is, they are a cultural product which links knowledge, values, aspirations and understanding through patterns of communication which celebrate the concerns of the lifeworld. 'Local' should be understood, however, to mean not only a small scale 'locale' but also those locales situated outside official discourses of power even though they might operate with global concerns in mind. Examples of such knowledges might be those articulated by, on the one hand, indigenous peoples (Aboriginal, Maori, Inuit, Basques, Welsh among many) and on the other by social movements (ecological, civil rights, feminist, or humanitarian for instance). [3]

Constructing School Culture.

With these arguments in mind we can now return to the notion of school culture in order to examine the options available in the construction of school culture. We need to do this with the four mechanisms of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and discipline in mind.

---

[3] This idea is more fully developed in my paper 'Leadership and the Rationalization of Society' (Bates,1989)

Pedagogy was earlier defined as the mechanism through which character and virtue are to be produced. This may seem an odd definition when contrasted with the more conventional definition of pedagogy as 'teaching method'. However, the 'problem' of method is not simply technical, though it is often presented as such. The problem of method is the reciprocal problem of how teachers get learners to learn what they wish to teach and how learners get teachers to teach what they wish to learn. Defining pedagogy as method avoids the cultural implications of this reciprocal problem. But this is a problem that will not go away and which can only be glossed over by the imposition of method.

Character and virtue are the products of social ideals shaped by shared historical experience. Greenfield captures some of this when he observes that

> What many people seem to want from schools is that schools reflect the values that are central and meaningful in their lives. If this view is correct, schools are cultural artifacts that people struggle to shape in their own image. Only in such forms do they have faith in them; only in such forms can they participate comfortably in them.
>
> (Greenfield, 1973:570)

This is a view shared by Giroux.

> Schools are historical and structural embodiments of forms and culture that are ideological in the sense that they signify reality in ways that are often actively contested and experienced differently by various individuals and groups.
>
> (Giroux, 1985:23)

Thus the social relations of pedagogy, between pupil and teacher, between teacher and teacher and between pupil and pupil inevitably carry certain conceptions of culture which celebrate particular ways of life. The classroom and the school constitute terrain on which the struggles over which definitions of character and virtue are to prevail take place. These definitions are linked to struggles over such definitions in the wider cultural context: over gender, race, class, geography and the various identities which are constructed as a result of social action and social priorities. Pedagogy is a form of social action through which pupils and teachers construct themselves as well as their shared social ideals and practices.

Giroux, again:

> If we treat the histories, experiences, and languages of different cultural groups as particularized forms of production, it becomes less difficult to understand the diverse readings, response, and behaviours that, let's say, students exhibit to the analysis of a particular classroom text. In fact, a cultural politics necessitates that a discourse be developed that is attentive to the histories, dreams, and experiences that such students bring to schools.
>
> (Giroux, 1985:39)

But this is not simply a matter of 'taking into account' the existing subjectivities of students and teachers or of abandoning judgement of alternatives, accepting that 'anything goes'. The cultural politics of pedagogy involves the creation through negotiation of a new civic virtue, one which is both local and global in its scope. As Giddens suggests, it demands a new form of 'life politics' focussed on the intimate links between the personal and the global, and on those issues of survival, justice, equity and social organisation which are both personal and universal in their importance.

> Life political issues cannot be debated outside the scope of abstract systems; information drawn from various kinds of expertise is central to their definition. Yet because they centre on questions of how we should live our lives in emancipated social circumstances they cannot but bring to the fore problems and questions of an existential type. Life-political issues supply the central agenda for the return of the institutionally repressed. They call for a remoralising of social life and they demand a renewed sensitivity to questions that the institutions of modernity systematically dissolve.
>
> (Giddens, 1991:224)

A pedagogy which relates the personal to the global, simultaneously addressing the issues of personal choice and collective dilemmas over cultural identity, environment, biological reproduction and the continuing degradation of the third world for instance, is a pedagogy which carries a new vision of character and virtue more suited to the condition of late modernity. The construction of such a pedagogy is an appropriate task of educational leadership.

Curriculum, is the second mechanism or message system which carries the culture of the school. Here the production of skill and knowledge is the focus for discourse and action. Here, we are presented with a new phenomenon, one driven by market models of knowledge itself. Bernstein presents the issue in this way:

> There is a new concept both of knowledge and of its relation to those who create it, a truly secular concept. Knowledge should flow like money to wherever it can create advantage and profit. Indeed, knowledge is not just like money: it *is* money. Knowledge is divorced from persons, their commitments, their personal dedication, for these become impediments, restrictions on flow and introduce deformations into the working of the market. Moving knowledge about, or even creating it, should not be more difficult than moving and regulating money. Knowledge, after nearly a thousand years, is divorced from inwardness and is literally dehumanized. Once knowledge is seperated from inwardness, commitment and personal dedication, then people may be moved about, substituted for each other, and excluded from the market... Now we have a dislocation, which permits the creation of two independent markets, one of knowledge and another of knowers.
>
> (Bernstein, 1990:155)

Earlier, I spoke of the commodification of culture and it is easy to see that here the commodification of skill and knowledge and its 'positioning' within a global market dominated by the interests of transnational corporations has important implications for school culture. There are several possibilities here. Firstly, the production and distribution of knowledge through markets dissociated from knowers might well lead to the redundancy of the school as a ubiquitous social institution. Secondly, schools might come to serve purposes of symbolic control, dissociated from the production of knowing subjects. Thirdly, schools might well be freed from the dominant emphasis on technical knowledge and able focus on the reconstitution of those subjugated knowledges which Foucault identifies, reshaping them into new possibilities which address more directly those issues of life politics identified by Giddens.

The politics of knowledge and skill, especially in conditions of massive decline in demand for both knowers and producers which seems to be characteristic of most Western societies are likely to increasingly revolve around these alternatives. The resolution of the cultural battles over these issues will have profound

implications for the culture of the school. Curricular leadership in these battles will be a demanding challenge.[4]

Assessment is the fourth mechanism through which schoool culture is articulated. Assessment serves dual and somewhat contradictory purposes. In the first place it serves an educational purpose in that it can inform the discourse between teachers and pupils regarding those things which pupils do and do not know and those things which they wish and do not wish to know. In this sense it can make both pedagogy and curriculum more transparent to both teacher and pupil and help to locate their discourse appropriately. On the other hand, assessment also serves managerial ends, in that it can (and typically does) constitute a means of surveillance and classification which subordinates both teachers and pupils to administrative ends.

The contrast between these uses of assessment is nicely caught by Foucault's discussion of Bentham and Rousseau's contrasting approaches to the issue of surveillance. For Bentham, the idea of the Panopticon was to produce an economy of power whereby the visibility of individuals was a mechanism through which they might be dominated. For Rousseau, the issue was, rather, the opening up of the secret places of society. Rousseau's dream

> ...was the dream of a transparent society, visible and legible in each of its parts., the dream of there no longer existing any zones of darkness, zones established by the privileges of royal power or the prerogatives of some corporation, zones of disorder. It was the dream that each individual, whatever position he occupied, might be able to see the whole of society, that men's hearts should communicate, their vision be unobstructed by obstacles, and that opinion of all reign over each.
>
> (Foucault, 1980:152)

In the culture of the school such issues are at the heart of the processes of assessment. Is it to be used for the purposes of making the curriculum and pedagogy of the school- its whole project- visible, or is it to be used as a form of classification and ordering which serves the purpose of domination through surveilance? This is an issue which is typically thought of in terms

---

[4]Some of the issues involved in this struggle are addressed in my paper 'Who owns the curriculum?' though not in quite the form they are discussed here (Bates,1991).

of the domination of pupils by teachers. It is, however, also an issue which should be thought of in terms of the definition and surveillance of teacher's work.[5] Much of the cultural politics of the school is centered around these issues.

Discipline, is the fourth major mechanism or message system through which school culture is formed. Discipline, in the way I wish to use the term catches up all those systems of rewards and punishments which articulate that endless administrative hierachy within which individuals are located through the exercise of managerial power. The greatest power exercised by the school is the power to locate an individual or a class of individuals within the hierachy of prestige bestowed by its certificates which can then be translated into social and economic capital within the wider society. Through such discipline the school transforms the moral basis of its culture into a system of administrative efficiency with the power to affect life chances. The disciplinary formula is that of the meritocracy: intelligence plus effort equals merit. Merit, it goes without saying, deserves reward. Equally, lack of merit is its own punishment for it commands little in the way of reward within the market of the surrounding society.

Current attempts to redfine the work of teachers in ways which transform a collegial/professional relationship into a more thoroughly administrative/bureaucratic one are indicative of a shift towards imposing 'market disciplines' in the public sphere. Ball catches these changes nicely:

> In the restructuring of teachers' pay and conditions, in specialist training for school management, in central control over curriculum and the possibility of comparative testing (of students, schools and teachers), the three basic elements of classical management theory are clearly in evidence. First, decisionmaking is formally lodged within the management team, separating policy from execution. Second, systems of quality control, time and motion study, and monitoring are brought into play through the development of teacher appraisal schemes and the use of cohort testing. The development of graded assessment schemes also fits quite neatly into a system of performance comparison between

---

[5]These issues are discussed in a somewhat less theorised form in my paper 'Educational versus managerial evaluation in schools' (Bates, 1984) but are particularly well taken up in relation to teachers by Ball (1990).

> teachers...Third, efforts are made to link pay and promotion directly to performance.
>
> (Ball, 1990:154)

Thus discipline is linked to surveillance for teachers as well as pupils and the hierachy of knowledge established through such surveillance (a particular regime of truth and power as suggested by Foucault) is offered as a structure through which the market can exact its own discipline. This however, is a calculus of value which may well be very different from a cultural politics concerned with the establishment of meaning, beliefs, values, aspirations and judgements of more deeply personal and wider social significance.

Leadership and school culture.

The previous discussion has been a condensed and abstract presentation of an inevitably complex issue. I hope you have been able to provide your own concrete examples of some of the issues I have touched upon. If not, then some of the papers I have referred to might provide such examples. What remains for me to do is to link this discussion with the notion of school leadership. In order to do so I wish to refer again to the three puzzles with which I began. The first is the puzzle of cultural formation and cultural difference.

I have referred to the cultural battles that take place under the umbrella of the pursuit of modernity; to the transformation of social structures increasingly dominated by industrialism, capitalism, surveillance and control; to the shifts in cultural formation and production that result; to the battle between lifeworld and system; to the dangers of a commodification of culture and the emergence of repressive regimes of power and truth. These are battles that effect both individual and collective futures. Schools are centrally concerned with such futures and those who would exercise leadership in such times need not only an understanding of such issues, but also of ways in which they can be articulated through the message systems of the school.

Such issues are directly related to the second puzzle, that of purpose and practice in the school. I believe I have sketched a number of alternative implications of current attempts to refashion pedagogy (the production of character and virtue), curriculum (the production of skills and knowledge), assessment (the mechanisms of classification and surveillance) and discipline

(the association of hierachy with reward) in ways that present some notion of the choices which face us as well as their possible outcomes. The battle for the definition of purpose and practice in the school is substantial and concrete and will have lasting effects on the resolution of the struggle between lifeworld and system.

The third puzzle, that of leadership is indeed a moral question as both Chris Hodgkinson (1991) and Tom Sergiovanni (1992) have reminded us, for leadership involves the making and articulating of choices, the location of oneself within the cultural struggles of the times as much in the cultural battles of the school as in the wider society. Such choices are historical both in the sense that history is made by our choices and the battles we chose to wage, and in the sense that history will judge our choices, our leadership, our heroism or our villany.

References:

Ball, Stephen J. (1990), 'Management as Moral Technology' in *Foucault and Education* (ed.) London, Routledge.

Bernstein, Basil (1990), *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, London, Routledge.

Foucault, Michel (1980), *Power/Knowledge*, New York, Pantheon.

Giddens, Anthony (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Giroux, Henry (1985), 'Critical Pedagogy, Cultural Politics and the Discourse of Experience.', *Journal of Education*, Vol. 167, No. 2, pp. 22-41.

Gitlin, Todd (1992), 'Uncivil Society', *Image*, Vol. No. Sunday April 19, pp.

Greenfield, Thomas B. (1973), 'Organizations as Social Inventions: Rethinking Assumptions About Change', *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, Vol. 9, No. 5, pp. 551-574.

Habermas, Jurgen (1987), *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol 2: The Critique of Functionalist Reason*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Heller, Agnes (1990), 'Existentialism, Alienation and Postmodernism: Cultural Movements as Vehicles of Change in Patterns of Everyday Life.' in *Postmodern Conditions* A.Milner, P.Thompson and C.Worth (eds.) New York, Berg.

Hodgkinson, Christopher (1991), *Educational Leadership: the Moral Art*, Albany, State University of New York Press.

Lee, Laurie (1969), *As I Walked Out One Midsummer Morning*, London, Andre Deutsch.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (1992) *Moral Leadership*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.